

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed May 11, 2005. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Response To Rejections of Claims 1-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ling* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059192 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.” *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Ling* reference. Applicant discusses the *Ling* reference and Applicant’s claims in the following.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponds to a resource;
soliciting input of search terms where said RL is invalid;
receiving input of said search terms;
searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms;
presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index that correspond to said search terms;
receiving selection of a RL from said list; and
retrieving and displaying content from said selected RL

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “soliciting input of search terms where said RL is invalid,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where:

the user would enter the request string in the address line of the browser being used. The browser would then attempt to access the page of the web-site

specified by the request string, but as the page address is invalid overall, an error message is generated. This error message is then trapped. . . . Trapping of the error message initiates the completion of the remaining procedure steps[, where] the results are then displayed in the browser that the user is utilising. In this way, a user will need only to enter the requested string and then await the return of the duly processed results.

Para. 0027 (Emphasis added). Thus, *Ling* fails to disclose the step of “soliciting input of search terms where said RL is invalid,” since *Ling* teaches that search terms are inputted without solicitation. Therefore, *Ling* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

b. Claims 2-7

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-7 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-7 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 2-7 should be withdrawn.

c. Claim 8

As provided in independent claim 8, Applicant claims:

A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to a resource;
determining if said RL is valid;
soliciting input of a RL search string where said RL is invalid;
receiving input of said RL search string; and
searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “soliciting input of a RL search string where said RL is invalid,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 8.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where:

the user would enter the request string in the address line of the browser being used. The browser would then attempt to access the page of the web-site specified by the request string, but as the page address is invalid overall, an

error message is generated. This error message is then trapped. . . . Trapping of the error message initiates the completion of the remaining procedure steps[, where] the results are then displayed in the browser that the user is utilising. In this way, a user will need only to enter the requested string and then await the return of the duly processed results.

Para. 0027 (Emphasis added). Thus, *Ling* fails to disclose the step of “soliciting input of a RL search string where said RL is invalid,” since *Ling* teaches that search terms are inputted without solicitation. Therefore, *Ling* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

d. Claims 9-10

Because independent claim 8 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 9-10 (which depend from independent claim 8) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 9-10 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 8. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 9-10 should be withdrawn.

e. Claim 13

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicant claims:

A method of selecting a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to a resource;
determining if said RL is valid;
generating a RL search string where said RL is invalid; and
searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a

name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where a search is performed to locate content that matches a search string query and does not disclose "wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in claim 13. *See, e.g.*, para. 0043. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

f. Claims 14-15

Because independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 14-15 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 14-15 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 13. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 14-15 should be withdrawn.

g. Claim 18

As provided in independent claim 18, Applicant claims:

A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:

controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device;
memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs;

and

said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where a search is performed to locate content that matches a search string query and does not disclose "wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in claim 18. *See, e.g.*, para. 0043. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

h. Claims 19-23

Because independent claim 18 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 19-23 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 19-23 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 18. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 19-23 should be withdrawn.

i. Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicant claims:

A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:
controller for receiving a RL from a user device;
memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs;
and
said controller is configured to generate a RL search string where said RL is determined to be invalid; and
said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 24.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where a search is performed to locate content that matches a search string query and does not disclose "wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that

correspond to said RL search string," as recited in claim 24. *See, e.g.*, para. 0043. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 24. Therefore, claim 24 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

j. Claims 25-29

Because independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 25-29 (which depend from independent claim 24) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 25-29 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 24. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 25-29 should be withdrawn.

2. Response To Rejections of Claims 11-12 and 16-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11-12 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ling*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that *Ling* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claims 8 and 13, as previously discussed. Further, the Office Action fails to introduce and cite art that cures the deficiencies of the *Ling* reference. Thus, claims 11-12 and 16-17 (which depend from respective independent claims 8 and 13) are allowable over *Ling* for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283